

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Ratent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bo) 1438 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,503	08/01/2001	Stefan Wahl	Q65395 3648	
75	590 09/20/2005		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,			SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
MACPEAK & 2100 Pennsylva	SEAS, PLLC unia Avenue, N.W.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	C 20037-3213		2145	
			DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005	5 .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/918,503	WAHL, STEFAN				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145 .				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 8/22/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
NOTICE OF APPEAL	nlianna with 27 CER 44 27 must be	filed within two man	the of the data			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3.   The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	hut prior to the data of filing a brid	f will not be entered	hagausa			
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling			
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro</li> </ol>		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a f nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	ched.			
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ance because:			
12 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	(PTO/SR/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other: \_\_\_

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd with regard to claims 11, 14; 35 U.S.C. 101 with regard to claims 11, 12, and 16.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The newly submitted drawings are acceptable as reviewed by the Examiner and the objection is withdrawn.

The objection to claim 14 is withdrawn.

The amended title is acceptable to the Examiner and the objection is withdrawn.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd to claim 11 is withdrawn.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 2<sup>nd</sup> to claim 12 is maintained. Applicant has not shown how a terminal with a computer readable medium can also comprise items such as a telephone, a television set, a radio station, and a mobile radio unit.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd to claim 14 is withdrawn.

The rejection over Hattori under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is maintained. Hattori does teach "linking a service required by a customer or an application required by the customer to a QoS category selected by the customer, and supplying the required service or the required application to the customer with the QoS category selected by the customer." Hattori implements a "customizing operation for each user and thereby supplying the service information to the user". This is a customer selecting a QoS category. See also column 5, lines 32-52. See also column 6, lines 1-6. See also column 6, line 58 - column 7, line 23. See also column 10, lines 29-40. See also column 12, line 66 - column 13, line 21. The user further "links a service" in column 13, lines 33-55 and in column 13, line 66 - column 14, lines 29-49 and column 15, lines 1-65, which both teaches linking a service to a QoS category and supplying the service with the QoS category. In regard to claim 14, Hattori as cited above does show "designating all services and applications with a QoS category, particulary in columns 14 and 15.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections and the Yamamura, Yamato, and How Networks Work references are based upon Applicant's prior arguments regarding Hattori, which the Examiner has previously addressed. The Examiner still maintains that because How Networks Work teaches the state of the art in the 1970s, that it does qualify as prior art.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER